REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005. Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-35 are rejected. Claims 1,3,5,7,9,11,13, 15, and 17-35 have been amended. Claims 1-35 remain in the application.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Hamilton et al. (U.S. Patent 6,392,993). The Examiner concluded that Hamilton disclosed every element of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1-35 as anticipated by Hamilton et al. Hamilton discloses a way of sending short data messages from a sending system to a plurality of receiving systems that reduces the networked traffic using two novel protocols. Hamilton discloses a Statistically Reliable Transmission protocol (Col. 2, Lines 3-17) which is tuned to reduce the probability that any single system will not receive a message. The second protocol, Positive Reliability Transmission Protocol, is employed when the Statistical protocol is insufficient and receipt must be guaranteed. Hamilton discloses that both protocols are based on UDP and both protocols multicast UDP packets to one or many recipients (Col 3, Lines 19-24). The packets transmitted using Hamilton's technique depend upon source and destination IP addresses and UDP ports in the IP and UDP portions of a datagram header (See Col. 10, Line 47 through Col. 11, Line 12). Hamilton discloses that most packet implementations will contain at least the destination ID, the sender ID,

each of which comprise an IP address and a port number, and a data field for those packets that transfer data (Col 12, Lines 25-33). Hamilton further discloses that the transmission list comprises the message number, a pointer to the beginning of the message buffer, and for each recipient, the recipient's UDP address (Col. 28, Lines 5-19). Hamilton states that as with other addresses disclosed in the specification, the UDP address of each recipient may comprise an IP address and a UDP port number. Hamilton fails to show or disclose a permanent ID that is mutually identifiable and permanent as in the claimed invention.

Applicant's invention is directed to eliminating dynamic IP address assignments or pseudo physical device IDs for networked clients (See Specification, Page 2, Lines 17-21 and Page 2, Line 25 through Page 3, Line 6). Applicant's invention achieves this by granting each client a permanent ID that is mutually identifiable and permanent. These permanent ID assignments result from the use of terminal IDs (See Specification, Page 34, Lines 15-16). A server maintains a database of the terminal IDs granted to the clients. The terminal IDs are represented by text (See Specification, Page 34, Lines 19-20). Unlike IP addresses which are granted to clients while connecting to the Internet, the terminal IDs do not require a prior Internet connection. (See Specification, Page 34, Lines 12-15). IP addresses, unlike terminal IDs are not permanent and are not mutually identifiable. Applicant's invention utilise permanent IDs which are represented by text such as characters and numerals (See Specification, Page 5, Line 28 through Page 6, Line 1). As is well known to those skilled in the art and discussed in the Background of Applicant's invention, IP addresses consist of 32

bits and are granted by a daemon upon logon to the Internet (See Specification, Page 32, Lines 3-20). The IP addresses for the clients are related to the network of the LAN. For example, if the LAN is [9.68.59] then the clients connected to that LAN receive an IP address of [9.68.59.255] (See Specification, Page 32, Lines 3-20). The IP addresses are not permanent or mutually identifiable.

Turning now to Hamilton, the reference specifically calls for the use of IP addresses as known in the prior art. Hamilton discloses that the novel protocols of the invention are based on UDP and both protocols multicast UDP packets to one or many recipients (Col 3, Lines 19-24). The packets transmitted using Hamilton's technique depend upon source and destination IP addresses and UDP ports in the IP and UDP portions of a datagram header (See Col. 10, Line 47 through Col. 11, Line 12). The IP addresses and UDP ports of Hamilton are not permanent or mutually identifiable as in the claimed invention. Applicant's invention in contrast, utilise the terminal IDs which are both permanent and mutually identifiable. Applicant believes the claimed invention is not anticipated by Hamilton and asks that the rejection be withdrawn. In order to even more clearly define an invention over that shown in Hamilton, Applicant has further amended the Independent claims to recited that the permanent IDs are in a textual representation (See Specification, Page 34, Lines 19-20 and Page 5, Line 28 through Page 6, Line 1). Applicant believes the amendments even more clearly define an invention over that shown in Hamilton.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with

Applicant's attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned. No additional fee is seen to be required. However, if required, please charge any necessary fees in support of this amendment to Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted:

David A. Mims, Jr.
Registration No. 32,708
(512) 823-0950
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT